

A BRIEF
DISCOURSE

Concerning the
Lawfulness of Worshipping GOD
BY THE
COMMON-PRAYER.

Being in
ANSWER

To a Book, Entituled,

*A Brief Discourse concerning the Unlawfulness of the
Common-Prayer Worship. Lately Printed
in New-England,*

Let all things be done decently, and in order, 1Cor. 14.40.

L O N D O N :

Printed for **Ric. Chiswell** at the *Rose and Crown* in
St. Pauls' Church-Yard. MDCXCIII.

IMPRIMATUR,

GEO. ROYSE.

August 9.
1693.

THE P R E F A C E.

HOW Pious or Learned the Author of the Book I undertake to answer may be, I am no more concern'd to know, than I am who the Author is, whom the Publisher hath thought fit to commend as such; and having so done, to conceal. But he is not (as far as I conceive) the more Learned or Pious for Writing this Book: Not the more Learned; for by all the helps he professes to have had from Diodorus, &c. he is guilty of many gross and palpable Mistakes: And not the more Pious, because of the uncharitable Reflections and Inferences he every where makes. For would any man of a truly Christian Temper alledge these things now against the Common-Prayers, which were alter'd or expunged above thirty years before he publish'd his Brief Discourse? Or charge us with violating the Word of God, because we change the word Sabbath for the Seventh Day; or say that we sacrilegiously steal from it, because Hallelujah, or Praise the Lord, is sometimes left out in the Reading-Psalms; or that we equal the Apocrypha to, and set it up above the Canonical Scriptures, because it's read on the Highest Holy-days (as he saith, but not very truly) who the Articles of our Church expressly declare them to be only of humane composition. Suppose now I should treat this Author after the same manner; and whereas he professes to have compared our Liturgy with the Missal, &c. I should take all advantages given in his Book, to shew, that notwithstanding this, he had never read them. I am certain, I could much more easily, and as charitably do it, as he make good his above-said Charge. For would any one conversant in the Missal, Breviary and Ritual of the Church of Rome, have said (as he doth, p. 5.) That Beza notes, that in the Roman Liturgy men are taught to cry, *Jesu Miserere mei*, no less than ten times one after another? For what need he quote Beza for that which he has (as he saith) read himself; and which after all, Beza mistook, and he with Beza; or rather he mistakes Beza in; since the *Jesu Miserere* thus repeated, is not in the Missal, &c. but in private Offices of that Church. Who again, that had been conversant in our Liturgy, would have said as the Author, Some have observ'd that of 172 Apocryphal Chapters, but 38 are omi-

The P R E F A C E.

ted? For what need he to be beholden to another's Observation, for what he that had thus read the Liturgy must have under his own eye? So easy is it to repay him in his own Coin, if we will reflect and infer after his way.

It's a shrewd sign this Author was hard put to it to make good his Charge against the Liturgy, and to prove his Point, That it's unlawful to be present at the Common-Prayer Worship.

And after all, it's of little Service to our Author, and those of his Communion, to make such Exceptions as he has done; for if all things were alter'd and remov'd that he objects against, they of his way would be no nearer to us than they are, as the things stand at present; as long as we are a National Church, and have a Liturgy; and whilst they continue Independent and Congregational, are against the use of any Forms, even such as are Scriptural (as the Lord's Prayer and Decalogue); nay, against reading the Scripture in their Publick Congregations.

Indeed he had dealt more sincerely, if he had acquainted his Reader, That they hold it unlawful to communicate with us, because we are a National Church; and that they don't joyn in the Common-Prayer Worship, because it's a Form, and all Forms are in his Opinion unlawful. This indeed had struck at the Root of all; but this he knew was not so easily prov'd, nor would look so popularly, as to cry out Heathenism, Judaism, and Popery, which he charges our Service Book with. This indeed will rouse the Multitude; and it's no wonder when possess'd with this Representation of our Worship, that the deluded People broke into the Church (Erected at Boston for the Worship of God, according to the Church of England) to search for the Images they supposed we worshipp'd. The time was when the Antinomians from among themselves, treated them in the like way, and call'd them Legal Preachers, Popish Factors, Scribes and Opposers of Christ. And they may remember what had like to have been the Effect of it, if they had not taken up what their Adversaries call'd a Bloody Tene. And truly we had reason to fear it, if there had not been a Superior Authority to over-rule it.

But I shall forbear to recriminate, and shall leave the rest to the Book, where I have let nothing escape that requires an Answer; and I hope have given a sufficient Answer to it, and in the issue have prov'd, That (as far as his Exceptions go) they have no reason to forbear being present at, or joyning in the Common-Prayer-Book Worship.

History of
Antinomi-
ans, in the
Preface.

1

A BRIEF
DISCOURSE
Concerning the
Lawfulness of Worshipping GOD
BY THE
COMMON-PRAYER.

THE Question proposed by the Author, is,
*Q. What are the Reasons why you judge it unlawful
to be present at, or to partake in the Common-Prayer
Worship?*

The Reasons he gives are four, taken,

1. *From the Original of the Common-Prayer-Book, which, saith he,
with the Ceremonies and Worship prescribed therein, I find to be in a
great measure Popish and Heathenish.*

2. *From the Manner of the Common-Prayer-Book.*

3. *Because Publick Liturgies of Humane Composition, are an Inno-
vation and Deviation from Primitive Purity.*

4. *In this Age of Light, it would be a great Apostacy in the least
to countenance or comply with the Common-Prayer-Worship.*

These are the Reasons he advances, and by which he endea-
vours to justify their continuance in a Separation from the Church
of England, and the Worship therein Administred.

And these I shall take the liberty to examine.

For the clearer discoursing upon which, I shall divide what
I have to say, into so many Chapters, *viz.*

1. *Of the Original of the Common Prayer, or English Liturgy.*
2. *Of the Manner of it.*
3. *Of the Original of Liturgies.*
4. *Of Worship by a Liturgy.*

CHAP.

C H A P. I.

Of the Original of the English Liturgy.

OUR Author saith, That the Common Prayer Book, with the Ceremonies and Worship prescribed therein, are in a great measure Popish and Heathenish; and therefore it is unlawful to joyn with it.

This will be resolved into Two Questions.

Q. 1. Whether the Common Prayer be taken out of the Mass-Book, and be Heathenish, as well as Popish?

Q. 2. Whether the being taken out of the Mass-Book, makes it unlawful to be used or joyned with, tho it be good and lawful in it self?

Q. 1. Whether the Common-Prayer is taken out of the Mass-Book? As our Author takes care to represent it, one would think there is little of the Roman Service left out in ours. *The Common Prayer*, saith he, *is in a great measure Popish—is taken out of the Popes Mass-Book—it cannot be denied it's derived from thence*, p. 1. *There is very little in the English, which is not to be found in the other*, p. 2. This is matter of Fact, and so is not to be determined by Authority. He himself makes a fair proposal, which I shall accept of, viz. *Let such as have any hesitancy about this matter compare the Popish Missal, &c. with the English Liturgy, and they will be convinced*, That he had never read and compared them; or is guilty of a notorious Abuse that he puts upon his Ignorant Reader, that after he pretends to have read and compared, shall assert so gross a falshood, and say, *There is very little in the English, that is not to be found in the other, &c.*

1. For there is little comparatively in the English, which is to be found in the Roman Liturgy, and far more is left out, than ever was taken thence. This is indeed directly contrary to what he affirms, and yet let any one compare them, and he will be convinced of the truth of it. Take that which is called *the Canon of the Mass*, or Form of Administring the Eucharist, and there is no Agreement, not one Collect or Prayer the same. Go we to Baptism, there is not one Prayer belonging to that Office that is in ours. And as for the Litany, there is not a third part of theirs in ours, and much in ours which is not in theirs.

2. There

2. There is nothing in the Service of the Church of Rome, which makes it *the Popes Missal*, and is peculiar to that Church, that is in ours; that is, there is no Popery in our Liturgy. This he is in part forced to acknowledge. *There are*, saith he, *things (as Prayers for the Dead, &c.) in the Roman Liturgy, which are not translated into English.* His *Et cetera*, if branched into particulars, would be very large, as he could not but know, if he had read and compared them. As for Example, Where are their Crossings, Elevation, and Adoration of the Elements? Where their Solitary Communion, and Communion in one kind? Where their frequent Crossings of themselves, and of the Book? Where their material Crosses, and the Adoration of them? Where their Prayers for the Dead? Where their Intercessors, the Virgin Mary and Saints, that are to be found in the Canon of the Mass? Where are the many Exorcisms, the Puffs they blow in the Infants face, their Conjurament of Salt, for a whole-some Sacrament to the driving away of Devils, that's put into the Mouth of the Infant, as a Propitiation unto Eternal Life? Where the Spittle with which the Ears and Nostrils of the Infants are touched with an Ephphatha, be opened? Where the Oyl of Salvation, (as it's call'd) wherewith the Priest anoints the Child's Breast and Shoulders in form of a Cross? Where the Chrism or Oyntment wherewith he anoints the Crown of the Head in figure of a Cross? Where the change of Garments, their Purple and White Robe, that the Child is to carry unspotted before the Tribunal of our Lord? Where the lighted Candle put into the Child's hand, that when our Lord shall come to the Wedding, he may meet him? Where the many Crossings of the Head before Baptism, and of the Eyes, Ears, Nostrils, Breast, Shoulders, Mouth, &c. to be found in their Ritual and Pastoral? Lastly, To go no further, Where are the *O Holy Mary, Mother of God, &c. pray for us*? Where are the Angels and Arch Angels, the Patriarchs and Prophets, the Apostles and Evangelists; the Martyrs, Popes and Confessors, the Priests and Levites, the Monks and Hermits, the Virgins and Widows, the Forty seven Saints in particular, and all Saints in general; that are called upon in their Litany, *Pray for us*? And if nothing that is truly Popish be to be found in our Liturgy, we have so far reason to deny that it's taken out of the Mass-Book.

3. I add, That our Service is so far from being taken out of the Missal, that whatsoever in it is the same with the Office in the Church

Trial
of the
Grounds
of Separ.
c. 8. p. 152.

Church of Rome; is mostly taken out of the Ancient Offices of the Christian Church. And because every one cannot compare it, I will produce Impartial Authority for it. Thus saith Mr. Ball, a Nonconformist of great Note in the last Age, *The English Liturgy is not a Collection out of the Mass-Book, but a refining of the Liturgy, which heretofore had been stained with the Mass, — and is not a Translation of the Mass, but a Restitution of the Ancient Liturgies.* So the Ministers of Old England, in a Letter to the Ministers of New England, wrote Anno 1637. *It's no hard task to them, that our Service-Book was reformed in most things according to the purest Liturgies, which were in use long before the Mass was heard of in the World;* p. 2.

To these I will add one more, for the Character our Author gives of him, viz. Bishop Jewel (whom he calls that great Light in the English Church, p. 9.) Who saith, *We are come as near as possibly we could to the Church of the Apostles, and of the old Catholick Bishops and Fathers. — And besides, we have aimed not only our Doctrine, but Sacraments also, and Form of our Publick Prayers, after the pattern of their Rites and Ordinances.*

To say the truth, its a very odd thing to represent our Liturgy as Popish, when those that composed and used the Liturgy, were burnt by the Papists for it, and when to this day they will not communicate in it, nor with the Church that useth it. Our Author saith, *There have been Jesuits and Popish Intelligencers that approved of our Service, and Pope Pius 5th would have ratified it?* And is it therefore Popish? The Independent allows the Presbyterian Confession of Faith; And this Author saith, p. 4. *It must be acknowledged that such of the Church-of-England-men, as keep to the 39 Articles in matters of Doctrine, are as Orthodox as any Protestants in the world.* And is therefore the Independent a Presbyterian, or this Author a Church-of-England-man? I trow not. All is, that they agree in the common Principles the other receives, and yet one is no more the other, than if they had no agreement in such Principles. And so is it here, the English Liturgy has nothing but what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Gospel, and allowable by the Christian Church; and therefore what the Papist will, or ought to allow; but for all that, we are no more Papists, nor that any more Popish, than the Independent is a Presbyterian, or our Author a Church-of-England-man. It was not then, because it was Popish, that they approved of our Service, but that it was Christian, and pure in its Order and Composition. It was not be-
cause

cause: it was Popish, that the Pope would have ratified it, but because upon any terms he would have prevailed upon Queen Elizabeth to own his Authority, and regain'd her to their Church.

4. However I deny not, but that the Compilers of the Liturgy did peruse the Popish Offices, and take as much from thence, as was conformable to the Ancient Offices, and was fit to be used; and that the rather, that they might the more easily satisfy doubting or discontented Minds under the Alterations then made, and induce them to comply with them. And this was the meaning of King Edward's Proclamation. A practice very Christian and commendable, and agreeable to the Apostolical prudence, which we read of, *Acts 15. 16. 3. 1 Cor. 9. 19, &c.*

And which the Nation soon felt the happy Effects of, when by this excellent Conduct it became, generally speaking, Reformed. But yet after all, so little was taken out of the Mass-Book, &c. that they differ'd more than they agreed in, and more was left than taken out.

But our Author stays not here, *That the English Liturgy, saith he, is originally Heathenish as well as Popish, is manifest, 1. In that the Pope's Liturgy from whence ours is deriv'd, is so. The principal Parts of the Mass-Book were borrowed from Idolatrous Pagans. They came from Numa Pompilius, p. 4. Ans.* It has been sufficiently made out by Protestants, that there is a great Affinity and Agreement between the Heathenish and Popish Rites; but our Author does an injury to the Argument, when affirming, that the *Principal Parts* of the Mass-Book were borrowed from Idolatrous Pagans, he goes no further than *Vestments, Holy Water, and Incense*, as if these were the *principal Parts* of the Mass-Book, and the chief things that that agreed in with the Idolatry of the Heathens.

But this indeed is not to our purpose; suppose there be this Conformity between the Papist and the Pagan; what is that to us, if we agree with neither? But that he attempts to prove.

But tho he cannot find *Incense and Holy Water*, and his *Ex cetera* among us, yet he saith, *What vain Repetitions does the Common-Prayer Book abound with? In one Service the Worshipers must repeat these words, Good Lord deliver us, Eight times over. And, We beseech thee to hear us, Twenty times over. The Gloria Patri is to be repeated Tens times in the same Morning or Evening Service. That the Heathens were wont to Worship their Idols just after the same manner, is clear from Matth. 7. &c. And Beza notes, That the Roman Liturgy does abound with them, wherein Men are taught to cry, Jesu, Jesu, miserere mei, no less then Ten times one after another.*

For the better Resolution of which, I shall proceed in this order.

1. We grant, that there may be such things as vain Repetitions in Prayers, and other Divine Offices, for that is a fault our Saviour charges on the Heathens; and what we, as well as our Author, charge on the Church of Rome, and is also frequently charged by those that use and plead for Forms, on those that use extemporary Prayers.

2. We yet do maintain, That there are such Repetitions in Divine Worship, as are not vain, that are neither Heathenish or Popish. Such do we read of in the *Old Testament*, as *Psalms* 57. 1. 75. 1, 4, 5. 94. 1. 103. 1, 2, 22. 107. 8, 13, 21, 31. 136. *throughout*. And thus our Saviour repeated the same words thrice in his Agony in the Garden, *Matt.* 26. 44. and twice on the Cross, *Matt.* 27. 46. And consequently all Repetitions are no more condemned by our Saviour in *Matt.* 6. 7. than all long Prayers are, *Matt.* 23. 14. So that the vanity of Repetitions does not consist in using the same words eight times or twenty times in Prayer. For do we repeat in our Service, *Good Lord deliver us*, eight times: And *Glory be to the Father*, &c. ten times? And, *We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord*, twenty times? So we find, that they not only had their thrice, and their four times, but their twenty seven times in every Verse of *Psalms* 136. *His mercy endureth for ever*; which *Psalms* was most used on solemn Occasions, as we may find it, *2 Chron.* 5. 13. 7. 3, 6. 20. 21. *Ezra* 3. 11. *Jer.* 33. 11. So that we may more truly say of the Church of God among the *Jews*, than he doth of the *Heathens*; and their Idols, that *they were wont to Worship God just after the same manner*; with Repetitions in their Service, as we.

3. We are to consider wherein the vanity of Repetitions consists, so as to be after the manner of the Heathens. This admits great variety, and just bounds cannot be set; so that it's not to be exactly said, Here the vain Repetitions begin. But they are such;

1. When they that use them, think that they shall be heard for *their much speaking*, as our Saviour saith, the Heathens did: Thus the Priests of Baal did, crying out, *O Baal hear us*, from Morning till Noon; and accordingly *Elijah* upbraids them, *1 Kings* 18. 26, 27.

2. When it is nothing but Tautology, *viz.* a Repetition of the same words without new Matter; or of the same matter, but in different words. Such were the Verses of *Battus* the babbling Poet. Such were the Hymns used often by the Heathens, in the worship of their gods. Such are the *Jesu, Jesu, &c.* without Intermission, sometimes used in the *Roman Church*.

But when there are distinct Petitions, as when we say, *We beseech thee to hear us good Lord*, it's as lawful to close each after that manner, as it is to say *Amen*, which we find to follow every particular Petition, and was distinctly repeated for twelve times together after that manner; *Deut.* 27. 15.

4. Vain Repetitions, are when the words are thought sufficient, tho the Heart be not with them; but this may be common to any. So that tho there are Repetitions in our Service, as there were among the Heathen, and are in the Church of Rome, yet ours are not vain, nor such Repetitions as theirs, by reason of the matter only, if accompanied with the heart.

3. He saith, *Some of the most Learned Patrons of Liturgies produce it as an Argument for them, that the Heathens made use of Forms in their Idolatrous Worship*; p. 5. And so he makes this the difference between the Heathens and Christians, that the first used Forms, but the last prayed without them. As for the practice of the Christians, we shall have occasion to speak of it under another Head; neither shall I trouble my self with the Opinion of those *Learned Patrons of Liturgies*, he speaks of: But I shall take his Argument as it lies before us, which is, That our Liturgy is Heathenish, because we use Forms as they did. He might as well have said, our Liturgy is Heathenish, because we use words as they did; since it's no more Heathenish to use Forms than Words. If they had the use of Forms, it rather shews the sense that Mankind generally have of this matter; and that there cannot be too great a care taken of our demeanour in Divine Worship, according to the Direction of the Wise man, *Eccl.* 5. 2. *Be not rash with thy mouth, &c. for God is in heaven, &c. therefore let thy words be few, and well-considered.* But if the Heathens had Forms, so had the *Jews*, so had Christians, as I shall shew; and so Forms no more make our Worship Heathenish than Jewish. But of this afterwards. But supposing, that our Liturgy was (as he would have it) taken out of the Mass-Book; yet,

Q. 2. Will the being taken out of the Mass-Book, make that Worship which is otherwise, good and lawful, to become unlawful to be used, or joyned with?

This he affirms, and offers to prove after this manner,

It's a known maxim, (saith he) Omnis honor Idoli est Idolatria. He that shall put any respect upon an Idol, cannot be clear of the Sin of Idolatry; but the Mass-Book is an Idol. And he that useth a Prayer, or joyns with a Prayer taken out of that Book, thereby puts an Honour upon an Idol. — How then can we joyn in Prayers taken out of the Idolatrous Mass-Book, and offer them to the Holy God?

In which there are there Three things contained.

1. That the Mass-Book is an Idol.
2. That to take a Prayer out of the Mass-Book is a respect to an Idol, and is Idolatry.
3. That it's unlawful to joyn in Prayers taken out of the Mass-Book.

1. *The Mass-Book is an Idol.* This we may justly question, because an Idol is the Representation of some Divine or Beatified Object, and that is as such propounded and set up for Adoration; such are the Images of God and our Saviour, of Angels and Saints in the Church of Rome. But in this sense the Mass-Book is no Idol; there is no Prototype or Object it represents, nor is any such Adoration paid to it, as is paid to an Image, or a Crucifix. We grant as well as he, that the Mass-Book is *Idolatrous*, as it contains some things that are so, and is used in Idolatrous Worship: But it no more follows from thence, that it is an Idol, than that the Incense, Holy Water, or Vestments, are Idols, which are used when they say Mass. But supposing the Mass-Book for once to be an Idol, that we may proceed to the next question, *viz.*

2. Whether the taking a Prayer out of the Mass-Book, be such a respect to it, as makes the Prayer to be Idolatrous? To this I answer, That the Prayers taken out of the Mass-Book, and inserted in our Liturgy, are so far from being a respect, that it is a disrespect to it. For at the same time that some Prayers were taken out, those were rejected that were left behind, for the gross Corruptions that were in them; and by so doing, the Reformers as much testified to all the World their abhorrence of it, as the emptying of the House of the Goods and Utensils not infected by the Leprosy, and their forsaking it, was a plain declaration of its Pollution. So that if Prayers taken from thence are good, the using them when taken thence, is no Idolatry, and Communion in them no Sin, and no more unlawful than it was to use the Vessels that were carried out of the infected House.

But this is the main Question, *viz.*

Q. Whether that which has been used in Idolatrous Worship, may, if otherwise good and lawful, be used where the Worship is not idolatrous?

This he denies, and for it offers these Reasons.

1. *We ought not to name an Idol, but with detestation; much less may we offer it as Worship to God.* Psal. 16. 4. Exod. 23. 13. Hos. 2. 16, 17: P. 4.

2. It was Paul's Judgment, that Meat once offer'd to Idols, should not be made use of, 1 Cor. 10. 28. Therefore a Service-Book offer'd to Idols ought not to be used. For there is a parity of Reason.

3. God hath strictly prohibited his people all symbolizing with the Heathen in civil usages, because he would not have them imitate the Heathen, Levit. 19. 19, 27. —especially in matters referring to the Worship of God. Hence they were prohibited going up by steps to the Altar, Exod. 20. 24, 26. to plant a Grove near the Altar, Deut. 16. 31. And to worship to the East, Ezek. 8. 16.

Before I proceed to consider these Arguments in particular, I shall state the Case it self; for resolving of which, we may observe.

1. That there are things idolatrous in their own nature, or by a standing positive Law, and so are always the same. Such is the Picture of God, and worshipping by Images.

2. There are things that have been customarily appropriated to Idolatrous Worship, and the use of which in common estimation, has been accounted Idolatrous. Such was the offering Incense among the Heathens; and therefore the Primitive Christians refused it, as an acknowledgment of their Worship; and the *Thurificati* were reputed Idolatrous.

3. There are other things that are used as well in true as Idolatrous Worship, and are lawful in themselves; such as Time, Place, Habit, Posture.

The first is always unlawful, and makes the Worship Idolatrous.

The second is not to be used where it has been thus appropriated, and thus accounted, during such an opinion of them.

So that it's the last of these that the whole turns upon; for after all the clamour he makes about Idolatry, and the charge he would fain fasten upon us, he can produce nothing that is Idolatrous amongst us, no Images, no Prayers to Saints, nor so much as any thing appropriated, or in common estimation so accounted; no incensings of Books or Images, no sprinklings of Holy Water; but it all amounts to this, that *Forms* and *Repetitions* have been us'd by Idolaters; that they had *White Garments*, and observ'd *Holy-days*; So p. 4, 5, 8. Which are things lawful in themselves (as I shall shew) and cannot be made unlawful by being us'd in Idolatrous Worship. For when Idolatry is not in the nature of the thing, but in the use, take away the use, and the Idolatry ceaseth; and consequently it may be lawfully used where there is no Idolatry in the Worship, and no Idolatry in the use of it. And if it be not to be used, it's not because it's unlawful in it self to use it, but because

cause.

cause it's forbidden by God, as was the case among the *Jews*; or because of some circumstances that make it inconvenient and dangerous. Thus it was lawful to eat that Meat, which had been offer'd to Idols, when it was a terward expos'd to sale in the Shambles, or set upon the Table at an Entertainment; because it was thereby restor'd to a common use; when yet it was not lawful to sit at Meat in an Idols Temple, for that was to have fellowship in the Idolatry, *Chap. 8. 10, 20.* It is then no more Idolatry to use a White Garment, or a Temple, or observe a Day, or to use a Prayer that has been used or observ'd in Idolatrous Worship, or by an Idolatrous Church, than it was to eat Meat that had been offer'd to Idols. Purifie the Gold, and separate the Dross from it, and the Gold is not the worse for the Dross that was before mingled with it. Scrape the Walls, and cast out the infected materials of it, so that the House be freed from the Leprosie, and it might have been as well inhabited as if it had never been infected, *Num. 14 41.* (to make use of former Comparisons, *p. 2d. and 3d.*) and take the things lawful from the things unlawful, and they become lawful again, and may be lawfully used.

But saith he, *The Rubbish of the Leprous house was to be cast into an unclean place: And the Leprosie breaks out still; therefore we may have no communion with it.* *p. 3.*

But surely it's the same thing if we leave the House that is infected, as it is to carry away the Rubbish into an unclean place; else why doth he talk of leaving the Communion for the sake of the Leprosie of Idolatry? We grant the Church we left to be idolatrous, there the Leprosie is; and therefore we left it; but we left the Idolatry with the Church, and let him prove there is any of the Leprosie of Idolatry in what we have taken out of it, and then he would say somewhat to the purpose; but that he is far from.

Let us however consider his Arguments relating to the general part. 1. We ought, saith he, not to name an Idol, but with detestation, much less offer it as worship to God.

I answer, 1st. The naming there forbidden, is the naming an Idol with respect; and indeed the addressing any Worship to it. So *Psal. 16. 4. Their sorrows shall be multiplied that hasten after another God; their drink-offering of blood will I not offer, nor take up their name into my lips:* That is, they might not name them by way of worship, nor offer Sacrifice to them.

2^d. Where is there such a naming of an Idol amongst us? what respect do we give to his Idol the *Mas's Book*? what Saint do we adore

adore? But, saith he, *The Prayers are taken out of the Idolatrous Mass-Book.* But what then, if there be nothing of their Idolatry in the Prayers that are taken thence, when such are taken thence they are no more idolatrous than before they were taken into the *Mass-Book*.

2d. He saith, *It was Paul's Judgment, that meat once offer'd to Idols should not be made use of,* 1 Cor. 10. 28. *Therefore a Service-Book offer'd to Idols ought not to be us'd. For there is a parity of Reason.*

I conceive he is much mistaken in the account he gives of the Apostle's Judgment, who is so far from maintaining *meat offer'd to Idols to be unlawful*, that he makes it a thing indifferent (as before); and what a person may with a safe conscience eat of without scruple, unless it be with respect to another's conscience that is thereby offended, as the Apostle determines it, v. 28, 29. Now if Meat offered to Idols might be eaten of, then a Service-Book that has been used in Idolatrous Worship may be lawfully us'd (when the things contain'd in it are otherwise lawful and good.) *For there is a parity of Reason*, as he argues.

3. He saith, *God hath prohibited his people all symbolizing with Heathen, &c.*

We grant that God did prohibit the *Jews* all symbolizing and agreement with the *Heathens* in their Idolatry. That is not the Question. But

1. Whether an agreement with Idolaters in what was once used by them in Idolatry, becomes Idolatry, or be unlawful because it has been so used?

2. Or whether what was forbidden to the *Jews* is forbidden to all people, and to Christians as well as they?

These we deny.

The first we deny as to the *Jews*, that every thing us'd in Idolatrous Service was unlawful to them; for he says, *The Priests of Isis used to wear Linnen Surplices*, p. 9. and yet such Linnen Garments were the Priests and Levites to officiate in. So Circumcision was used among the *Egyptians, &c.* and yet continu'd to be used among the *Jews*.

Again, we deny that what was in that kind forbidden to the *Jews*, was forbidden and unlawful to all. For

1st. A great part of what they were forbidden; was with respect to the people that before inhabited the Land; with whom they were to make no Covenant, but were utterly to destroy them, their Altars and Groves, &c. Exod. 23. 32, 33. 34. 12. Deut. 7. 2, 3, 5.

A Brief Discourse concerning the

2. They were a people very prone to Idolatry, and so were tied up by strict Restraints and Penalties.

3. They both came from *Egypt*, where they had long convers'd with Idolatrous Service, and afterward border'd upon Nations violently addicted to Idolatry and Sorcery; and in such circumstances there were these Checks laid upon them; and an assimilation to the Customs of such forbidden.

And all this was not from the nature of the thing, and because all usages of Idolaters were unlawful, but because of the circumstances of people, time, and place: And if so, then we must leave the case of symbolizing, and no longer make it a Case of Conscience, but of prudence and expediency; and so we are left to judge what is fit to be retained, and what not; what practis'd, and what not.

And here our Reformers shew'd their Prudence and Moderation, by what they chose; when the Ceremonies were few; and what were the Ceremonies of the Protestant Church, rather than the *Romish*. When they chose some, that they might not give offence to the Churches of Christ in other parts of the World; and yet retain'd no more, that they might not burden their own Communion. When the Offices they selected were agreeable to the Ancientest Offices of the Church.

So that there was no Reformation in any place, where so much temper was preserv'd, and where the purity of Religion, and the sincerity and solemnity of Divine Service were more regarded: that what was good was retained; what was noxious was purg'd out, and even what was superfluous was excinded.

But this he will not allow.

For, saith he, *the use of such a Liturgy doth harden the Papists in their Idolatry*, p. 4. So the Liturgy came from Rome, and will perhaps lead thither again. p. 18.

But 1. How can such a Liturgy harden them in their Idolatry, or lead thither, which has none of their Idolatry in it; and in which the Papists are expressly charg'd with Idolatry? *Vid.* Rubrick at the Communion.

2. How can this harden them, or lead thither, which has been the means of banishing and keeping their Idolatry out of the Kingdom?

3. How can this harden them, or lead thither, when the Papists agree with our Author, *That it's unlawful to be present at, or partake in the Common-Prayer Worship*, and are excommunicated if they do?

4. How can this harden them, or lead thither, when there is nothing that the Papists more labour to possess the people with pre-

But he adds, p. 4. *The Jews themselves are scandalized by the Liturgy. It's a celebrated Saying among them, That the Christians have their Jepphilleth from Armillus; that is, their Prayer-Books from Antichrist.*

At what are the *Jews* scandalized? Is it that we have a Liturgy? So have they themselves had of latter Ages at least. And so the Author saith, p. 13. That he had seen *Liturgies written in the Hebrew Tongue.*

Is it that we receive our *Prayer-Book* from *Antichrist*? Yes, saith he, and for this quotes a *Celebrated Saying* of theirs. But is this the truer for their saying so? They say, it seems, that *Christians* have receiv'd their *Prayers* from *Antichrist*: But I hope that there are many *Christians* in the World, that have *Prayer-Books* which they never received from the *Antichrist* he speaks of; So the *Greek Abyssins*, &c. The whole is at least a sorry Mistake, and which, for ought I see, he understands no more than we do his *Jepphilleth*. The case is plainly thus; That the *Rabbins* say, that *Armillus* was to be a person of prodigious form, begot of a Marble Statue in *Rome*, and was to be the last Enemy of the *Jews*, and the Leader of the *Christian* Forces against them; that he should kill *Messias Ben Ephraim*, and at last be killed by *Messias Ben David*. That he should give *Jepphilleth* תפלה, and a Law to the *Christians*, which he and they set up in opposition to the Law of *Moses*. So that we see that his *Jepphilleth* is the Law as well as the *Prayers* of *Christians*; and they make *Armillus* to be toward the end of the World, the last Enemy of the *Jews*; and how could our *Liturgy*, or the *Liturgies* now used by *Christians*, be the *Prayers* received from *Armillus*, when *Armillus* is yet to come, according to the *Rabbinical* Notion? If the Reader pleases he may have a fuller account of this *Jewish Garagantua* in *Buxtorf's Lexicon, Chald. Talmud. Rabbiam*; for I am weary of this trifling, and unintelligible Jargon.

C H A P. II.

Of the Matter of the Common-Prayer-Book.

BEfore I proceed to the particular consideration of his Objections relating to this Head; let me observe, that if we should grant what he finds fault with to be blame-worthy; yet it's not to the purpose, and the point he proposed; which is to give *Reasons why be*

judges it unlawful to be present at, or partake in the Common-Prayer Worship.

And that for these Reasons. For

1. There may be many things that are a reason against Ministerial Conformity, which will not be a reason against communion with the Church; since there are those things required to the one, that are not required to the other. Such is the Surplice, the Office for burying the Dead, Marrying, p. 8, &c. which belong to the Minister, and not to the People: And therefore tho it should be unlawful to wear a Surplice, or use these Offices, yet since Lay-Communion is not concern'd in them, they are no reason for separation.

2. Many of his Objections are only directed against the occasional Offices, and so can be no reason against constant communion in the Daily Office, or in those Offices in which they do not occur. As supposing what he alledgeth out of the Office of Burial, Marriage, Baptism, &c. to be true and sufficient, yet tho they may be a reason against being present at the Offices of Burial, Baptism, and Marriage, they are no reason against Communion, where those Offices are not concerned.

3. Things inconvenient, if not unlawful, are no reason for a separation, because then there could be no Communion with any Church; since no Church is without them: And if we should grant the reading a worse Translation of Scripture, and the *Apocrypha*, in the Church, to be things of that nature; yet it will be hard to shew them to be unlawful in themselves, and so to make it necessary to withdraw from the Church where they are used.

If these things be consider'd, most of what he has said will be prevented; but that I may not seem to avoid any thing, I shall take notice of the Particulars as they lie in order. And his Arguments taken from the Matter of the Service-Book, are

(1.) *Some things appointed therein are in the judgment of sober and judicious persons extremely ridiculous. As how?*

First, saith he, *How many odd and senseless Translations of the Holy Scripture have been found therein?* It's well, he said have been found; for he is fain to draw all his Inferences of that kind, but one, from the Service-Book, as it stood before the last revision, and that is *Psal. 58.9. Or ever their pots be made hot with thorns, so let indignation vex them, as a thing that is raw.* At which he triumphs, *What nonsense is this!* Now I do not think that to be Nonsense which is not soon understood; for then what will he make of the *Hebrew* in this Verse, which has several difficulties in it? But I think there is a good account to be given

given of the sense of this Version; and that is, Ere that the Pots are made hot with the Thorns, they shall be severely punished: The being made hot with the Thorns, sets forth the suddenness; and the phrase, *vexing a thing that is raw*, denotes the severity of it.

(2.) His next Instance of *thingt extremely ridiculous*, is, that in the Liturgy, the Writings of the Prophets, Acts and Revelations, are called Epistles. If these were formerly, they are not now so called; but of these when read in the place of Epistles, it's said, *The portion of Scripture for the Epistle*. That is, the Sections of Scripture read in that order, are generally Epistles; and so, as it's usual in other cases, gives the name to all: And as it is not now, so never was it called the Epistle of the Prophets, Acts, or Revelations; but the Epistle taken out of *Isaiah*; &c.

(3.) He objects against the Responses, *Those broken Responses*, saith he, and *shreds of Prayer* (as Mr. Cartwright calls them) which the Priests and People toss between them like Tennis-Balls, seem extremely ridiculous to standers-by. Without doubt this is a venture of Wit; but I suppose there are standers-by that will call it by another Name; and instead of Wit, term this scurrility in Conversation, and prophaneness in Religion; Especially if we consider how many Psalms there are in Holy Writ, that are penn'd (or supposed at least to be so, by Learned men) after this way. And whatever his Standers-by may think, there are persons of Piety ancient and modern, that have thought this way very becoming, and of excellent use to quicken Devotion, and excite attention. What may not be said in any case by such persons as these, that call this way of Devotion (as he doth) *a taking God's Name in vain*? And what occasion may others take after the same manner, to treat their long Prayers, that are often nauseous to standers-by, for their affected length, and tedious enlargements, and forced Repetitions.

2. He objects, *The Common-Prayer Book is guilty of violating the sacred Word of God*: And here he charges it with no less than obliterating, contradicting, adding to it, and detracting from it; and then concludes, *Amongst men, clipping and corrupting of Coin is Treason; and certainly it's a dreadful thing to add to, or take from the Word of God.* Deut. 4. 2. Rev. 22. 19.

And it's certainly a dreadful thing; and wo to them that are guilty.

Here I should have expected a rounder Charge by one that had so exactly read the Liturgy, and that he would have told the World that we take whole Chapters from the Word of God, and which have no place in our Kalender, nor are read publicly in the Church,

as I do acknowledge. And surely if the omission of one Verse in a Psalm, and of Hallelujah in others, be a *taking from the Word of God*; then much more is the omission of whole Chapters; nay, of three whole Books. But he durst not pret's that too far; for if he had, it would have fallen hard upon such as never have the Scriptures read in their Congregations, tho' that was a solemn part of Divine Worship in the Churches of God, as the Scripture informs us, *Act. 15. 21, &c.* And if the Church of *Rome* is so deservedly blamed for reading the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, what do they not deserve that never read them at all in their Congregations? Surely if they had, according to our Saviour's advice, considered the Beam in their own eye, they would not have thus magnified the Mote in their Brother's eye. I remember a Question in a Book of the same kind with our Author's, *Whether Protestants do not sin in defrauding the people of some Books and Chapters of Scripture, as well as Papists in defrauding them of all.* And then what sort of Protestants are they, that with the Church of *Rome* defraud the people of all, so far as the Publick Service of God is concern'd?

Survey
the Book
common-
ver;
1610.
6.

But to return: Before I shall consider his few Instances, that he would make good this Bloody Charge by, I shall premise a few things.

1. That the Instances he offers are, at the worst, Mistranslations, Slips, and Errors, and not chargeable with perverseness, according to what we charge upon the Church of *Rome*. For here is no interest to be served: For what is our Church concern'd, whether it be read as the Liturgical Translation has it, *the 7th Day*; or as the Common Translation, *The Sabbath*; whether as that, *they were not obedient to his word*; or as this, *they rebelled not against his word*; whether as that, *The rod of the wicked cometh not into the lot of the righteous*; or as this, *restrain not*: Whether as in that, the Titles of some Psalms and Hallelujahs are omitted; or as in this, they are inserted. Surely here is no interest visible in this, that should incline our Translators of the Psalter to pick out these Texts above all others to make bold with.

2. Mistranslations and Errors of this kind, are no sufficient reason for not using such a Translation, and much less for separating from a Church where they are used; for then no Translation could be us'd, or no Church communicated with, because no Church is without such Translations, and no Translation without such Errors. Thus it was in the Church of the *Jews*, when the Septuagint was used in publick; Which doth often alter and add to the original *Hebrew*; and yet was not only used, but is quoted by the Divine Writers, even in many places where those Alterations and Additions are. So it alters, *Heb. 10. 5. 11. 21. Rom. 10. 18. Act. 7. 8.* It adds, as *Luk. 3. 36, 37. Act. 7. 14.* Then

There also must not our common Translation be used, which besides the mistakes allowed to be in it, does add in many places, and particularly half a Verse, 1 John 2. 23. So it adds the Dates and Subscriptions to the Epistles, Chapters, Verses, and Arguments, throughout the whole, as if Canonical. And of this kind are all his Instances.

As (1.) He saith, *The Common-Prayer-Book violates the word of God, as sometimes the words of Scripture are obliterated, and others put in their room. Thus in the Catechism they have changed those words in the Fourth Commandment, The Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, into the Seventh day.*

A. We grant it is so; but it's to be remembred, that it's not so in the 20th of Exodus, but in the Liturgy; and if the Liturgy differs from Exodus, it's a difference without a distinction, since the Seventh day and Sabbath are all one; and if it differs from Exodus, it agrees with the first Institution, Gen. 2. 3. where it's said, *God rested on the seventh day, and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.*

(2.) He saith, *Sometimes the Liturgy makes bold directly and in terms to contradict the Scripture; so Psalm 105. 28. it's said they were not rebellious, but the Common-Prayer-Book saith, they were not obedient; and so Psal. 125. 3.*

We grant, That there is a seeming contradiction in words, but not in the meaning of it; for the relative *they* being undetermined, and indifferently to be applied to Moses and Aaron, or to the Egyptians, accordingly is this place to be interpreted; if understood of the former, it's to read in the Common Translation, *they were not rebellious*; if of the latter, it's to be read in the Translation of the Liturgy, *they were not obedient*. And this last reading is according to the present reading of the Septuagint, and some other Translations that follow that. And yet that Translation was generally used by the Primitive Christians, and was worse than any ever used by us. As for Psal. 125. 3. *The rod of the wicked shall not come, &c.* that is, so as to rest there, and so as to tempt them beyond what they are able.

(3.) He saith, *Sometimes the Common-Prayer-Book adds to the Scripture; there are three whole Verses added to the 14th Psalm. And the Gloria Patri is frequently added to Scriptures, as if it were Canonical.*

Ans. When he saith, *That it is a dreadful thing to add to the word of God, and charges our Church with it, we might expect some very criminal instances to make it good; and when he saith three whole Verses are added, one would think that this was somewhat invented, and herein inserted by the Church upon some wicked selfish design. But 1. tho we allow that such Verses are added, yet it's not an addition to Scripture; for tho not found in this place, yet they are in anot her, viz. Rom. 3. 13. and quoted by the Apostle from other*

A Brief Discourse concerning the

Psalms, &c. 2. It's not the Common-Prayer-Book that adds, but the Translations which the Common-Prayer followed, viz. the Septuagint and Vulgar; and tho it was a mistake, yet it's far from being such as incurs the penalty of *Deut.* 4. 2, &c.

As for the *Gloria Patri*, I deny that it's added to the Scriptures as Canonical, any more than the Contents of the Chapters, the Chapters and Verses of the Bible, or the Dates of the Epistles are; nay, I deny that it's added at all; for any one that can read, will see that it's not inserted in the Psalter, but only rehearsed as the Rubrick directs. And it was for a good end that this was anciently used in the Orthodox Churches of old, and is continued in ours, viz. in opposition to the *Arians*, and *Anti-Trinitarians*. *Sozom.* l. 26.

(4) He saith, *Sometimes words are sacrilegiously stolen out of the Bible. As the last Verse is omitted, Psal. 72. So are the Scriptural Titles of many Psalms. And I know not how often those words, Praise ye the Lord, are left out.*

He durst not trust his Reader with the things left out, for they would have appear'd of so little Consequence, as would have betray'd the weakness of his Cause, as well as his own Ipote: That verse omitted, *Psal. 72.* is this, *the Prayers of David, the Son of Jesse, are ended.* The Titles of the *Psalms* are for the most part such as are no key to the matter of them, and without which the *Psalms* are as intire as the Chapters without the Contents: The Clause, *praise ye the Lord,* is in the *Hebrew, Hallelujah,* and is only left out when it's independent, and has no immediate Relation to the preceding or following Verse. And the reason of these Omissions seems to be, Because the *Psalms* being to be read in parts, according to the ancient Custom in *Chrysostom's* time and before, or chanted, and so read on without naming the Psalm, the Titles, &c. would have made a break in that order. And this was done after the manner of Singing the *Psalms* in the Temple-Service, in which the Titles, and the passage, *the Prayers of David the Son of Jesse, are ended,* were to be sure no part. And so it is in the Singing-*Psalms*, used by the Dissenters as well as us: And who may as well be charged with such Omissions as we, who there for the reason above said, use neither the Verse nor Titles. Surely these Persons are hard put to it, that after such a bloody charge of violating, adding to, and taking from the Word of God, can produce no better proofs and evidences for it, but only that we leave out the Titles and *Hallelujah*, and that only in the ordinary Service in the publick, where they themselves read it not at all; and when upon the like way of arguing, we may charge them with

laying

laying aside the whole Scripture, out of which they read not one Chapter for the Information of the People. He goes on.

3. *In the Liturgy the Apocrypha Books are made equal with, nay advanced above the Holy Scripture.* Strange! that a Church should be guilty of this, that in their Articles exclude them out of the Canon; and faith, That they are not read to confirm any Doctrine, but only for informing the Manners. But let us see how he proves this, not by any Assertion of the Church, but some stretches of Arguing. As,

(1.) They are made equal. For in the Preface to the Common Prayer, it's said, *Nothing ordained is to be read but the pure word of God, or that which is evidently grounded on the same.* But is the Apocrypha so?

Here for improving his Argument, he alters the words of the Preface; and for that which is in that, *agreeable to the same*, He reads *evidently grounded on the same*; and then triumphs, *Is the Apocrypha so?* But take it how he will, it's evident from hence, that the Apocrypha is so far from being made equal with Scripture, that there is a plain difference between them; for that to which a thing is agreeable, and on which it's grounded, is above that which is agreeable to it, and grounded upon it. A Plea grounded on the Law, is surely of less Authority than the Law on which it is grounded. The Apocrypha being read, not for establishing any Doctrine, but for informing the Manners; there is nothing in what is appointed of that kind to be read, but what is agreeable to the word of God, and not contrary to it; and so may be read, as well as their Sermons be heard, which can pretend to no more.

(2.) He saith, *The Liturgy appoints the Apocrypha to be read as Lessons, just as I find it in the Pope's Service Book, and in a greater proportion than Scripture; for (as some have observ'd) of 172 Apocryphal Chapters, but 38 are omitted. So that these Books are equalized with the pure word of God.*

But surely he doth not find it in our Service-Book, that the Apocrypha Lessons are read for Canonical Scripture, and declared to be so, as they are in the Pope's Service-Book; but only as Apocrypha. He that will look for the Apocrypha Books in the Pope's Bible, as well as Service-Book, will find them mixed with the Canonical, as *Hester* and *Esdra*, &c. but he that will find them in our Bibles, will find them by themselves, and Apocrypha in the head of them.

If, as he affirms, the Apocrypha is read in a greater proportion than Scripture, it doth more than equalize, and doth rather advance it above the Scripture, and so belongs to his next Assertion, which he would have done well to have reserved it to, to make up the proof he is there wanting in.

As

As for what he affirms, that the Apocrypha is read in greater proportion than the Scripture; nothing more false. For,

1. All the Second Lessons throughout the Year, are out of the *New Testament*.

2. All Epistles and Gospels read on Sundays and Holy-days, are wholly out of Canonical Scripture.

3. All First Lessons on Sundays are out of the *Old Testament*, and none out of the Apocrypha.

4. On the 33 Holy-days on the Week-days, there are but 26 Apocrypha First Lessons, whereas there are 40 out of the Canonical Scripture.

5. When the Apocrypha is appointed to be read in course, it's not clear two Months for First Lessons, but the Holy Scripture is read all the other Ten Months, and more.

6. Of the 39 Books of the *Old Testament*, but 3 are entirely omitted, viz. *Chronicles* and *Canticles*; but of the 13 of the Apocrypha, 6 are not read at all.

7. Of the 929 Chapters of the *Old Testament*, 753 are read in course, and 176 only omitted: (the reasons for which generally will appear to the Reader); but out of the 172 Chapters of the Apocrypha, there are (not as he saith 38) 66 omitted, and among them that of *Tobit*, that he objects against. Where methinks he that pretends to have read and compar'd, should have had more value for his own understanding, than to be beholding to others, and to say *some have observed*; for there is nothing like a man's own observation in matter of Fact.

(3.) He saith, *The Liturgy advanceth the Apocrypha above the Scripture, by intimating that they are more edifying, and can be less spared than many portions of the Holy Canon; and by ordering them to be read on the highest Holy-days, and many of them twice, some thrice in one year.*

Methinks in such a round Charge as this, that *the Liturgy advanceth the Apocrypha above Scripture*, he should have had more than an intimation for his evidence. He calls it before, *High-Treason*; and surely it's very hard to be condemned for it by a bare *Innuendo*; and yet even he fails in his intimation. For 1. if it were true, that the Liturgy ordered the Apocrypha to be read on the *highest Holy-days*, and many of them *twice or thrice in the Year*; it would not follow, that they accounted them *more edifying, and less to be spared than Scripture*; especially when Scripture is read on the *highest Holy-days*, and some portions of it twice or thrice in the year too.

2. It's not true, that it's ordered to be read on the *highest Holy-days*: For on the *highest Holy-days*, there is nothing but Scripture to be read; such are all the days dedicated to our Saviour, as the *Nativity*,
Circum-

Circumcision, Epiphany, Good-Friday, Resurrection, Ascension; and all the Lords-days.

3. He saith, *Many of them are read twice, some thrice in the year.* For the twice, it's only 25 Chapters, viz. 7 in *Wisdom*, and 18 in *Ecclesiasticus*: And as for his thrice, there is none but the 5th Chapter of *Wisdom*, which after it had been read on the *Conversion of St. Paul*, has 17 Verses of it read on All-Saints. But now, as to the Scripture, the whole *New Testament*, except the *Revelation*, is read over twice in the year in course, besides Epistles, Gospels, and Lessons out of it on Holy-days. And the *Old Testament* is read over once, except as before excepted, in course. And many Portions are read again in the Service of *Sundays* and Holy-days, which amount to above 140 Lessons; and some few have a third Course.

Would any one that observes this, think such a Writer, a Person of any care, I had almost said Conscience; that utters as black Slanders as Pen can write, or Mouth can utter, and charges a whole Church with violating the Word of God, and adding to it, and detracting from it, and of advancing human Writings above it, and yet shall come off with changing a Seventh day for Sabbath, with leaving out Hallelujah, with Intimations, and Falsties, with others Observations, that pretends to have read and compared, and what not; and after all, charges us with this, for Lessons appointed to be read in the Publick Congregation, when they themselves read none at all; and have no other Translation of Scripture, than what was translated by us, and which they use in Common with us? This is hard usage indeed; and if we should retort upon them in the like way, we should think, if we may judge of their value for Scripture by their Publick Service, there are none have a less esteem for it than they, that read not one Chapter of it by way of Lesson throughout the year, as has been before said.

4. He saith, *Such things are enjoyed in the Common-Prayer-Book, as (to my Conscience) cannot be practised without Sin.*

But what is this to those that are not obliged to practise them? What is it to Laymen, that the Priests are required to give the Holy Communion to all new-married Persons; or to use the Prayers over the Dead; or to put the Ring on in Marriage; or use the Surplice, &c.?

But what is this which cannot be practised without Sin?

1. *Ministers are required to give the Holy Communion to all new-married Persons, whereas Marriage-Festivals use to be accompanied with such Diversifements as unfit them. By this Doctrine, all that may Marry, may come to the Lord's Supper, whereas Marriage is an Ordinance which Men as Men*

D

(and

A Brief Discourse concerning the

(and not as Christians only) have a right unto. So that by this Prescription many will eat and drink Damnation to themselves.

Ans (1.) If this was required, yet it's not inconsistent with that it te, which is rightly call'd, *The Holy Estate of Matrimony*; and besides, those Divertisements do not precede but follow.

(2.) Surely those Persons that are married amongst us, are supposed to be Christians, and not to be married merely as Men.

(3.) If any eat and drink their own Damnation, it's their own fault; and the danger of it doth not release any of their Duty, or justify their neglect of it.

(4.) But the Common-Prayer-Book doth not compel them; it saith only, That it's convenient at their Marriage, or at the first opportunity after it.

2. When any Man is buried, the Priest must say, *Almighty God has taken to himself the Soul of our dear Brother, perhaps the most wicked Wretch on earth. And that his Body is committed to the ground, in sure and certain hope of a Resurrection to Eternal Life; Tho he did never truly, nor so much as visibly, to the judgment of Charity, repent of his Sins.*

A. 1. The Office of Burial, supposes that of Visitation of the Sick to go before, where the Minister is appointed to examine, *Whether he repent him truly of his Sins?* &c.

2. It supposes the Exercise of Discipline, and that such as he speaks of, have the Censures of the Church exercised on them, which if it be not exercised, we know whom we are to thank for the relaxation of it.

3. However, the Church provides not for extraordinary, but ordinary Cases; and if an extraordinary Case happens, and be notorious, no Rule then binds.

4. If it be not notorious, it's safer to err on the charitable side.

5. It's not now said, That it's certain hope of a Resurrection to Eternal Life.

3. *The putting on the Ring in Marriage, especially the making that Ceremony to be an essential Matter, is Superstition.*

A. 1. What Superstition can there be in this, more than in joyning of Hands, both of which are Civil Rites; and fit Declarations of pledging their Troth to each other?

2. How can that be Essential, which is one of the alterable things meant in the Preface?

3. It's necessary there should be some Rite used, and some actions by which the espousal should be solemnized, and why not a Ring as well as joyning hands? And why not these as well as others? Therefore *Bucer* calls it, a very fit Ceremony. *Script. Angl. cens. c. 20.*

4. *Churching Women, and their Offerings, is Jewish Superstition.*

A. (1.)

A. (1.) Why Jewish? Is there any other Sacrifice than that of Thanksgiving offered, as there was, *Levit. 12. 6.*

(2.) What Superstition is there more in kneeling down at offering up Thanks to God, than in putting up a Bill. However the said Author saith, *This is agreeable to Scripture, c. 24.*

5. *The Observation of Popish Holy-days, especially such as are dedicated to Saints, I look upon as highly Superstitious.*

A. (1) He looks upon them as such, but how far soever his Opinion may pass with his own Disciples, yet others expect somewhat more.

(2.) Why doth he add Popish? Surely he that has read and compared the Popish Liturgy with ours, must needs know that we have no Holy-days for Popish Saints in our Liturgy. As to which, I shall refer our Author to Mr. Perkins on *Gal. 4. 10.*

6. Of the Surplice, he saith, *It's highly Superstitious. When Holy Vestments were in use among the Jews, they had an express Command for them. Should they have made a Mitre or Ephod, or other Ecclesiastical Garments of their own heads, they would have sinned greatly? Witness Judg. 8. 27. If then the Church of God had no power to appoint Sacred Vestments, no more has the Church in these days. — Moreover the Surplice is immediately borrowed from Idolatrous Mass-mongers. — Dr. Abbot (who was no Fanaick) saith, That all Priestly Garments, whereby Ministers are distinguished from the rest of the Church, are a special part of the Character of the Beast. The Papists take the Surplice from Jews and Heathens. There were Vestments for the Worshipers of Baal, 2 Kings 10. 12. Bishop Jewel saith, The Priests of Isis used to wear Linnen Surplices. Moreover the greatest part of our Protestant Divines have disliked this Superstitious Garment. So Martyr, &c.*

1. His Argument is, the *Jews* had express Command for their Garments, &c.

A. (1.) Had the *Jews* no Power to appoint or observe any thing relating to Worship without express Command? How then come the Feasts of *Purim* and *Dedication*, the Places and Houses of Prayer? Nay, whence came the alteration of the posture at the Passover (which our Saviour complied with) contrary to the first Institution? And surely Vestments are much of the same nature with Times and Places, &c.

(2.) Supposing the *Jews* might not, what is that to us? Yes, saith he, *no more can we.* Why so? The Apostle shews we have a liberty they had not, and we may as well do what they could not, as forbear what they might not. They had not a liberty as we, because under a School-master, and of a Temper that needed it, and whose Service was Typical. And yet notwithstanding this, they had a liberty which they might use, and much more than have we.

A Brief Discourse concerning the

(2.) The Surplice, he saith, *is immediately borrowed from Idolatrous Misi-mongers.*

A. 1. What is that, if there be no Idolatry borrowed with it? Do we use it to sanctify Holy-water, Bells, &c?

2. As for his Quotation from Dr. Abbot, it's a gross mistake, or somewhat worse; all he saith is, That the Buyers and Sellers, Rev. 13. 16. are the Bishops, Priests, and Monks, that expose to sale Masses and Indulgences, &c. that bind themselves by Oath to the Bishop of Rome, and in testimony of it, are divided from the rest of the Church by Rites, Vows, Unctions, Treasures, Garments. Where he speaks of Garments in general, and no more of Surplices than Gowns; and of Garments they ordinarily wear, such as belong to Monastick Orders, &c. But if he had spoke of all Garments that distinguish the Clergy from the Laity, Dr. Abbot had been in that a Fanatick, and not Dr. Abbot, who himself wore such Garments, and surely did not think by that, he had a special Character of the Beast upon him.

What he quotes from Bishop Jewel, is not in that place (if any where) he refers to; neither in the English or Latin Volume.

(3.) The Papists take the Surplice from Jews and Heathens; and for this latter, quotes the Priests of Baal.

A. But the Text doth not say, they were any more White, than Blew or Black; and he might as well have prov'd our Gowns we ordinarily wear, or others prove their Cloaks to be such, as well as he prove our Surplices heathenish from that Text.

(4.) He saith, *The greatest part of our Protestant Divines have disliked it.*

A. 1. What saith he to the Lutherans, who all use the like? Are not they Protestants?

2. Do any he names dislike it so, as to think it unlawful!

3. Do they dislike it so, as to make a Schism in the Church; or for it Separate from a Church?

I am certain these he produces, do declare just contrary. Thus Pet. Mrt. Epist. Amico & Hoopero, &c. Beza Epist. Grindallo. Zanchy Confess. c. 25. §. 30. Hemingius in 4 Leg. Decal. §. 29. &c. Enchir. tit. Adiph. c. 16. Polanus in Ezek. 44. And Zanchy chuses the Linnen before the Woollen Garment for Divine Offices, as a Sign of Innocence and Holiness, de Redempt. c. 16. I could much enlarge the Catalogue of such Testimonies, if it were necessary.

So little did these Learned Men think Mr. Nichol's Argument of any force, which our Author proposes, viz. 'That all Vestments appropriated to the Worship of God, and appointed for the Signification of Spiritual Duties, by the will of Man, are unlawful. But the Surplice is so.' And is, he saith, *Not easy to be answer'd;* but if it be

to be answered, no matter whether it's not easy. From hence arise two Questions.

Q. 1. Whether it's unlawful to use any thing appropriated to the Worship of God by the Will of Man ?

Q. 2. Whether it's unlawful to use any thing in the Worship of God that is appointed for the signification of Spiritual Duties by the Will of man ?

By the first it's unlawful for men to appropriate places, or times, or postures to the Worship of God. And so it's necessary to avoid this Superstition, to make all the Meeting-places to be Houses of Merchandize, and to be equally divided between Religious and Common Uses. By the 2d any thing that has such a Signification applied to it, is made unlawful, by vertue of such Signification, and which without such Signification would have been lawful. So a Surplice would have been a lawful Garment, if not appropriated, and without Signification; and might have been in its self worn as well as a Cloak, since Custom and Use only makes the difference; but appropriate it, and clap a signification upon it, it's unlawful: And so a Cloak may be turn'd out of Service by the same way. So it's in posture, kneeling and standing are indifferent; but once appropriate kneeling to Prayer, and make it significative, and to be a posture of reverence, and it becomes unlawful. And so without end. So much for Mr. Nichol's Argument, and its difficulty.

7. Come we now to the Cross, *the greatest Devil amongst all the Idols of Rome*; as he tells us Mr. Parker sheweth.

He saith 1. The first users of it were the Hereticks, *Valentinus* and *Montanus*.

A. That seems hard, when those that wrote against them used it, as *Origen*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Epiphanius*, did against the former; and several others against the latter. We find it as ancient as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, &c.

2. He saith, Mr. Parker *proveh it a sin against all the Commandments, and a breach of the Letter of the second: for men to appoint a Religious Ceremony, is a direct violation of the 2d Commandment, which forbids all human Inventions in Divine Worship, as any part thereof.*

A. 1. There is a way of proving too much, and that any one that reads Mr. Parker will soon perceive he doth: And of this I take this Instance of the 2d Commandment to be one of the letter, of which the Author saith, the Cross is a breach. Now the Letter of the Command respects two things; 1. Not to make any Graven Image for Religious Worship. 2. Not to bow down to any such Object.

Now

A Brief Discourse concerning the

Now the Cross used in Baptism is an *Aerial Cross*, as he calls it; and where is the Object or the Worship? But our Author goes on to prove it after this manner; *for men to appoint, &c.* Here we grant the Proposition to be true, because God only is to appoint his own Worship; and so it's not in the power of man to appoint any part of it: But now if Religious Ceremonies may be, and yet not be part of Divine Worship, then they are no such human Inventions as are forbidden; and no direct or indirect violation of the 2d Commandment. Therefore it remains upon him to prove the *Cross* a part of *Divine Worship*: For we say it's only an adjunct, and is no more a part of Worship, than the striking the Blood upon the Door-posts was (to make use of *Zepperus* his Similitude) or sitting or kneeling at the Sacrament.

3. He saith. *The Arguments which are brought against the use of Oyl, Cream, Salt, Spittle in Baptism (practised by the Papists) hold as well against the Cross.*

Ans. This I deny; for the Scripture speaks honourably of the Cross of Christ, which this refers to, but not at all of the rest. Again, the Cross was traduced and reproached by the *Heathens*, which gave occasion to the use of it, and so were not the rest. So that this was used with reason; those without it.

His instance of the *Gallows* looks so prophanelly, that I shall rather pass it by, than correct it.

4. He saith, *The Papists adore the Cross, and it's an Idol, &c.*

Ans. But do they adore the *Aerial Cross*? But what is their Adoration (if it were) to us, that do not adore it?

5. *This hath been testified against by Zegedinus, Lepperus (it should be Zepperus) Goulartius. &c.*

Ans. The *Lutheran Churches* use it. See *Hemingsius, &c.* *Bucer* accounts it neither indecent, nor unprofitable, but a Ceremony of much simplicity, and of present admonition of the Cross of Christ; *Scripti Angl. censur. c. 12.* And generally they account it lawful, and not a sufficient reason for separation; but to be used, so it be without Superstition. So *Goulartius* in *Cypr. lib. ad Demetr. c. 9.*

8. His last Instance of Superstition is, *kneeling at the Sacrament.* Let us consider what he has to say against it.

1. He saith, *Men pretend in it reverence to Christ; but Christ himself was personally present, when his Disciples partook of the Lord's Supper; yet they did not kneel, but used the Table-gesture then customary among the Jews.*

Ans. How is he certain the Disciples did not kneel, but used the customary Posture in receiving? For the *Jews* in the Passover changed Postures, and did not throughout keep to that of discumbency. See *D. Lightfoot.*

2. The

2. The Question is not what they did, but what may lawfully be done; and then the Question is, whether kneeling be unlawful?

3. They themselves no more observe our Saviour's Posture, than the *Jews* did that required at the first institution. Our Author words it cautiously, when he saith the Disciples used the Table-gesture *then customary*; for he well knew it was not sitting, but leaning, or lying along, and that they used this by way of signification.

4. If the Table be the Rule to guide us, then to put on our Hats is fuitable, as he knows who reasons.

2. He saith, *Good and wise men have chosen great sufferings, rather than comply with this Invention.*

Ans. And there were good and wise men that compiled the Liturgy, and used and enjoined this posture; which is an argument he seeks to overthrow, p. 16. And as Good and wise men have allowed and approved it; and thought it by no means allowable to separate and break Communion for it. Such as *P. Martyr, Zanchy, Beza, Zepperus, &c. Bains, Noyes, Ames, Cartwright, &c.*

3. *In primitive times Christians did not kneel in the participation of the Eucharist.*

Ans. 1. It's certain they did not sit, for they had no Notion at all of a Table-gesture, as appears by the use of the Word Altar, and that they counted that a posture of irreverence.

2. If they stood (as he saith) on the Lord's days, their standing was a posture of adoration, to be sure, when they received: So *St. Cyril* expressly, *Catech.* 5.

3. It's probable that on other days, when not obliged to stand, that they kneeled; and since they received every day, on six Days they kneel'd. So *Just. Mart. respons. ad quest. 115.* and that more especially, because they had a Prayer at receiving, as we have.

4. He saith, *It was enjoined by Pope Honorius, being fitted to the Idolatry of Transubstantiation, &c.*

Ans. 1. This is a mistake; for *Honorius* did first indeed decree Adoration to the Host, but not kneeling at it. For that is a posture no where enjoyn'd in the Church of *Rome*; and some of them say, it ought to be received standing; but which way, whether sitting, standing, or lying, or kneeling, is not material say others, as the *Pope* Espence himself ordinarily receives sitting, unless he celebrates; and then, as all Priests then do, he receives standing. And all adore not at the receiving, but at the elevation of the Host. *nus de a. ra. Eus. l. 2. c. 3.*

5. He saith, *That Religious Worship, which is before a Creature, and with respect to it, having no allowance from God, is against the Commandment: but so is kneeling before the Bread and Wine.*

Ans.

A Brief Discourse concerning the

Ans. 1. I question whether God ever allow'd any Religious Worship before a Creature, and with respect to a Creature; for that is Idolatry, and no allowance from God can be supposed to justify or require Idolatry.

2. I deny that there is any Religious Worship with respect to the Bread and Wine; For that, saith our Rubrick, *were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.* But it's only, as it's there said, for a signification of *our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the Benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers.*

6. He draws a Conclusion from the whole, *The English Liturgy is very corrupt; now to offer to the Lord a corrupt thing, is evil, Mal. 1. 13.*

Ans. A corrupt thing there, is what is plainly prohibited: Now let him prove the things before disputed to be such: As for example, that kneeling is forbidden. As for that place in *Malachi*, I leave to his perusal the *Letter of the Ministers of Old-England to those in New-England*, p. 14. where that is explained.

C H A P. III.

Publick Liturgies of humane Composure are an innovation, and deviation from primitive Antiquity: And again, Set Forms of Prayer devised by men are an Innovation.

FOR this he offers several Arguments.

1. Saith he, *Had a Liturgy been needful for the edification of the Church, undoubtedly Christ, or the Apostles by his direction, would have composed one, which none of them ever did. And therefore these men who take upon them to compose and impose a Liturgy on the Churches, assume to themselves more than Apostolical Power.*

Ans. I deny his consequence: For tho' our Saviour and his Apostles did, declared and left all things essential to a Church, yet there were many things needful to the edification of the Church in future Ages that were not expressly provided for. Our Saviour told the Apostles, that it should be given to them in that hour what they should speak; and they spoke all Languages by present infusion; and so were not obliged to think before, or study or learn a Language; and this was with relation to the present condition of the Church in those times. And there are no directions for after Ages to learn Languages, &c. So there was a miraculous gift of Prayer in the Apostolical times (as St. Chrysostom observes, *Hom. 14. in Rom. 8.*) and no express directions given about it

it, when that Gift should cease (as he saith it did) and when by the cessation of it, Forms would be necessary. Thus saith *Capellus* (*Theſ. Salmar. Part. 3.*) *As soon as miraculous Gifts ceased, and Hereticks began to trouble the Church, there was a necessity for Liturgies.* And therefore *Mr. Ball* saith, *The Christian Churches* for the space of this 1400 years at least, if not from the Apostles times, have had their stinted Liturgies. *Triall*, p. 96, &c. So Letter of Min. of Old England, l. 66, &c.

But this our Author denies, and calls it an Innovation.

And saith, 2. *The Liturgies father'd on the Apostles, and the ancient Writers* (called Fathers) *Learned men have evinced to be spurious.*

Ans. It's granted, that those father'd on the Apostles were so; but tho not the Apostles, yet many of the Prayers in them were ancient, and the main of that call'd *St. James's*, was used in the Church at *Jerusalem*, as *Dr. Cumber's* [*Original and Use of Liturgies*, p. 97.] in Answer to *Clarkson*, has shew'd from *Cyril*.

2. It's certain there was a Liturgy composed by *St. Chrysostom* and *Basil*, and a great part of what is so call'd was certainly theirs; as the abovesaid Author has shew'd, p. 167, 172, 209. and of this mind were * *Mornay* and † *Rivet*.

3. The least that can be observed from these Books, is, that when those Books were writ, then Liturgies were in use; so *Daille*; *We deny not but many of these Liturgies are ancient, and written about the beginning of the Ninth Century, tho they were corrupted by Addition and Alterations at several times after their first original.*

3. He would prove from an obscure Passage in *Justin Martyr* and *Tertullian*, that there was no Book of Prayer used by Christians 200 years after Christ.

Ans. The Passage in *Justin Martyr* is, *εὐχὰς ἑαυτῶν καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὁμολογίας αὐτῶ ἀναμνησέται.* Which our Author is forced to corrupt, and add to, before he can work it to his purpose; for thus he translates it, according as strength and utterance was afforded to him from Heaven: Whereas word for word it is, in like manner he [the President] offereth up Prayers to him [God] as he has power, that is, as fervently as he could: and so the same Phrase a little before. Of this see *D. Cumber*, p. 33, &c. And as little does the Passage in *Tertullian* make for his purpose, which is, That the Christians prayed, *Sine Monitore quia de pectore*; which surely relates not to the praying extempory; for what testimony was that of their Loyalty, more than if they pray'd by a Form; but his plain meaning is, they needed no Prompter (as the Heathens) but prayed heartily for the Emperors, &c. as their Offices shew'd.

* Of the
Mass l. 1

c. 6.

† Censur.
10.

De cultu.
Lat. l. 3

c. 13.

4. He saith, "That there was no Liturgy in some Churches, or in general use in the Church, for above 400 years, is manifest from *Socrates*; who saith, *There were scarcely two Christians found who used the same words in Prayer*, 1. 5. c. 21.

Ans. 1. Here he perverts again: For (1.) *Socrates* doth not say two Christians, but two Churches. (2.) He doth not say, they used the same words, but the same manner.

2. The Words of *Socrates* do not refer what he would have; for he saith, *In some among all Sects you shall scarcely find two Churches agreeing in the manner of Prayer*: Which refers not to the Words, but the Ways, as before described, viz. lighting up Candles, &c.

2. Supposing it was to be understood of the Words, what's that to Extempore Prayer? for they may not have the same words, when yet they may have Forms. The Historian's meaning is, That the Churches had different Forms of Prayer, as well as different Rites: So *Mornay* speaking of the Liturgies of the Greek and Latin Churches;

Ma. l. 1. Tho in substance the Service of these Churches do agree, yet we must not think there was one and the same Prescript Form observed, and kept in them all.

5. He saith, *Some plead, that in the Jewish Church of old there were Forms of Prayer, besides those of Divine Inspiration*; (but that was not;) and are all late compositions.

Ans. 1. If there were Forms of old in the Jewish Church, of Divine Inspiration, and those Forms to be used (as the Scripture shews), then it shews that Forms may lawfully be used.

2. That the Jews had set-forms of human composition, of ancient times, Learned men agree: So *Mornay* shews; and that the First Christians framed themselves after this manner of Service.

Ma. l. 1. p. 19. 3. Nay, Learned men observe, that Forms were used in our Saviour's time; and yet he is so far from condemning them, that he attended their Service, and composed a Form like to theirs. So *Vol. I. 157. Dr. Lightfoot.* 158, 161.

So that we see he has failed throughout in his attempt of proving Liturgies and set-forms an Innovation. But I can tell what is an Innovation; and that is, To hold Liturgies unlawful.

CHAP. IV.

It's an Apostacy in this Age of Light, to countenance or comply with the Common-Prayer-Book Worship.

UPON this his chief Topick is:

That Good and Learned men have born witness against the Corruptions of the English Liturgy, and chose to suffer rather than comply with it.

Ans. 1. There have been as Good and Learned men that have shew'd those not to be corruptions.

2. There have been several of his Learned and Good men, as he saith chose rather to suffer, than sin, by complying with the Liturgy, that have shew'd those Corruptions not to be a sufficient reason for Separation: So Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Nicols, &c.

3. They were so far from refusing Communion for them, that the Old Nonconformists ordinarily and constantly used the Common-Prayer-Book in their publick Ministrations; as Mr. Ball, one of them, declares, Tryal, p. 121, 155.

4. All of them testified against the Brownists, and a separation from the Church. *It was* (saith Mr. Baxter) *the Parish-Churehes that had the Liturgy, which Mr. Jacob the Father of the Congregational Party wrote for communion with. The same I may say of Mr. Bradshaw, Dr. Ames, and other Nonconformists, whom the Congregational Brethren think more favourable to their way.*

In the close, our Author offers some farther objections from the false and corrupt Doctrine he pretends to find in the Liturgy.

(1.) As, that it's certain by God's word, that Children baptized dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved: This, saith he, favours of Pelagianism.

Ans. I don't understand the falseness, or Pelagianism of it. It's certain by God's Word, that of such is the Kingdom of God, and so they must be capable of it. If capable of it, it must be upon Gospel terms; but what terms they are capable of but Baptism, I understand not.

(2.) That there are two Sacraments necessary to Salvation; which implies a double Error, viz. that the Sacraments are necessary to Salvation; and that there are more Sacraments of the New-Testament than two.

Ans. I don't see wherein is the first Error, if he had truly represented it; for it's said in the Catechism, two Sacraments generally necessary; that is, that they are a Duty belonging to all persons that

are capable of it ; where there are persons to baptize, and a Congregation to communicate with ; and therefore is not said absolutely, but generally necessary.

As for the latter, a Sacrament is not a Scripture-word, but a Term of Art, and so hath been variously used and applied ; and therefore to set out what it means, the Church has defined what a Sacrament is, and then shew'd there are but two ; And so this Phrase is used to distinguish it from any other so called ; and that then none but these two are generally necessary to all Christians.

(3.) *The Book saith, Some Sins are deadly, as if the Popish distinction of sins into Mortal and Venial, were a sound distinction.*

Ans. How can that be, when Fornication, which is called deadly in the Liturgy, in the Church of Rome is ordinarily accounted a Venial Sin ; and when the distinction between Mortal and Venial (as used in the Church of Rome) is so contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of England ? It's plain that our Church means thereby no other than heinous.

(4.) It's said, *Christ has redeemed all mankind.*

Ans. The Scripture saith, *God will have all men to be saved ; and that Christ died for all, &c.*

2. *A stinted Liturgy*, he saith, *is opposite to the Spirit of Prayer*, Eph. 6. 18.

Ans. 1. If so, then the Spirit will not communicate it self in a Liturgy, or stinted Form of Prayer, contrary to the sense of all sober Divines. So Dr. Owen : *Supposing, saith he, those who make use of, and plead for Forms of Prayer, especially in publick, do in a due manner prepare themselves for it by holy meditation, &c. I do not judge that there is any such evil in them, as that God will not communicate his Spirit to any in the use of them.*

2. If so, then almost all Churches in the world for these 1300 years, at least, to this day (as Mr. Baxter allows) have been without the Spirit of Prayer.

3. If so, then we cannot lawfully communicate in, or with a stinted Liturgy, which has yet been approved by all Reformed Churches, as Mr. Ball saith ; and Mr. Norton saith it's lawful to embrace Communion with Churches, where such Forms in Publick Worship are in use.

4. As for Eph. 6. 18. that we are to pray with all Prayer ; why is that not possible by a Liturgy, when there are in it Supplications, Prayers, and giving of thanks ?

3. He lets pass the Argument, from the mischief of a prescript Liturgy, and so will I pass what follows from the trivial, unintelligible, and dirty Reflections of it. For he knows we can match his Fidler,

Fidler with Stories of some of those that have been Eminent the other way, and could argue upon the sinfulness of unpremeditated and conceived Prayer.

4. He saith, *Mr. Cotton* speaketh weightily, in saying, *It's unlawful to bring ordinarily any other Book into the Publick Worship of God, besides the Book of God.*

A. I know no difference between Reading and Reciting in this case; and I have heard *Mr. Cotton* used a Form of Prayer in the Pulpit. If he did not, yet all the Nonconformists in former times did, as far as ever I could learn.

See Cler
Collect. o
Liver, p
38.

To close all; he undertakes to Answer an Objection, That *Good men were the first Collectors and Publishers of the Liturgy, and died Martyrs.*

This he endeavours to answer; and yet when it's to serve his own Cause, it's a considerable Argument. Thus saith he before, *The Corruptions of the Liturgy have been born witness against by good Men; and his Father, a Holy Man, suffered much for his Nonconformity, and what not.* Now surely, if this sort of arguing is good for them, it's good for us.

But he Replies further,

1. *All Persons employed in it, were not good Men, as Day, Bishop of Chichester. He was a dissembling Hypocrite, pretending to be a Protestant, but afterwards shew'd himself to be a Papist.*

A. Here he betrays gross ignorance, or somewhat worse. For *tho Day* was one of the 18 Bishops employed for compiling the Service-Book at first, *Anno 1548.* yet at that time he was for Transubstantiation, and Solitary Masses, and against having the Service in the Vulgar Tongue.

Burnet's
Reformat
Part 2. f
62. and
Num. 25.

And when the next Review was, which was 1550. when *Cranmer* wrote to *Bucer* about it, it does not appear that *Day* was concerned; nay, rather that he was against it, for he refused to set his hand to the Book, before it was enacted by a Law; and was afterward turn'd out of his Bishoprick, and depriv'd. But to say all in a word, What was this *dissembling Hypocrite* to those who were truly Pious Men, and acted faithfully according to the Light they had? as our Author acknowledgeth.

Ibid. p. 16:
p. 203.

2. He saith, *Good men chang'd their minds, so did Ridley and Cranmer.*

A. Both gross mistakes. For Archbishop *Cranmer* took upon him to defend the Common-Prayer, Ministration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, when in Prison.

Fox's Axi
and Monu
ments, Fo

A. 3

And Bishop Ridley, a little before his Martyrdom, in a Letter to his Friend, saith, *This Church had of late the whole Divine Service, all Common and Publick Prayers, framed to the true vaine of Holy Scripture.*

And again, after his Condemnation, writing an Answer to Grindal, concerning Knox's peremptory Exceptions against the Service-Book; I grant, saith he, *a Man (as he is) of Wit and Learning, may find apparent reasons; yet I suppose he cannot soundly by the Word of God so disprove any thing in it.*

3. He saith, *Others were much troubled at the Service-Book;* as Bishop Hooper, and Mr. Rogers at home; and Calvin, Bucer, Martyr, Bullenger, &c. abroad. So Alasco and Knox, the first Reformers in Scotland.

A. As for Hooper's dissatisfaction, it was not at the Liturgy, but the Episcopal Vestments; in which also he at last complied.

And as for Bucer's mind, and Pet. Martyr, the English Reader will find it in the History of the Reformation, p. 154, 155. And Calvin to the English Exiles at Frankford, declares against a rigorous Opposition, and was pleased that he retained Moderation in this Case.

As for Alasco and Knox, whatever they objected against the Liturgy, yet both had their Publick Offices, and Forms of Prayer.

4. He saith, *In Queen Elizabeth's time, the Bishops made the Common-Prayer-Book in several things worse, and more intollerable than it was in the days of King Edward 6.*

A. 1. And I hope he will confess in many things better.

2. Why those Prayers, &c. were left out, he may see in the History of the Reformation, p. 77, 170, 392.

The reason of which has been before justified.

3. There could be no great alteration to the worse, if that was all that he mentions; and however is nothing to us, when the Rubrick of the Communion is restored.

And now, that he may end as he begun, as he would have our Service-Book come from Popery; so he will have it, *That time will discover that some, who pretend Zeal for the Common-Prayer-Book, are carrying on a design for Rome.*

And time has discovered, that some of those who pretended Zeal against the Common-Prayer, carried on a design for Rome, and helped them forward in it, or stood as it were Neuters; and that the Liturgy has not so much a tendency that way, as Separation.

The World saw it in the late Reign, and found that the Church that uses the Liturgy, was a Bulwark against Popery; and when those that were against the Liturgy, either basely complied, fawn'd upon it, or cowardly were silent.

The Second Question.

Q. 2. *What reason have you to scruple the lawfulness of laying the Hand on the Book, and Kissing the Book in Swearing?*

To this he Answers,

1. *We do not find in the Scripture the Lords Servants were wont to swear after this manner; we read of lifting up the hand, &c. which is a natural sign of Worship.*

A. 1. We find in Scripture, that they were wont to put the hand under the Thigh in swearing: And thus the same *Abraham* that lift up his hand, required his Servant to swear, by putting his hand under his Thigh, *Gen. 24. 2.* and so *Jacob* made his Son *Joseph* to use the same Ceremony when he swore, *Gen. 47. 29.* Now, what natural Sign of Worship was in this Rite?

2. Since we find different Rites us'd, it's a sign that practice of the Lords Servants is to be no Rule to us in this matter; but that we are to govern our selves by the Custom of the place where, and the People among whom we live, if there be nothing in it self unlawful.

3. He saith, and seems to allow it, That the *Romans* of old, and *Italians*, and *Spaniards*, use to lift up the Finger when they swear solemnly. Now I conceive lifting up the Finger is no natural Sign of Worship. And if it had any signification, I know no reason why the *Germans* may not lift up three Fingers; to intimate, they invoke the Sacred Trinity, which he saith, he cannot justify. Nor why we may not lay the Hand upon, and Kiss the Book in token of belief of it, and of our acting according to it, and of our being judged according to it.

For the Word of God doth not prescribe in such cases.

2. He answers, *Laying the Hand on the Book is a symbolizing with Popish Idolaters, and Superstitious Jews.*

A. 1. It's not a symbolizing with Papists as such; since there are Papists that use other Ceremonies in swearing, as he saith, The *Italians*, *Spaniards*, and *Germans* do. And therefore, if this be a reason, as we must not lift up the Fingers, because they do so; so we must not lift up the Hand, because that is not to be done, but we must lift up the Fingers too.

2. If it was customary among the *Jews* to produce the Law in giving an Oath, I see no reason to condemn it; and so know no hurt to observe it. They used also to adjure Persons, and our Saviour readily answers to it, when thus call'd upon.

A Brief Discourse concerning the, &c.

3. He replies, *Kissing in a Religious way, is a gesture of Adoration.* And he closes it, *This is clearly to worship a Book; and so to give unto a Creature that Honour which is due to God alone.* And before he saith, *So help you, the Contents of this Book; is not much better than when the Papists say, So help me God, and these Holy Evangelists, which is gross Idolatry.*

A. 1. That Kissing may be a token of Adoration, when the thing kiss'd is an Object of Adoration, is acknowledged. But it's not a token of Adoration, when the thing kissed is not an Object of Adoration. Thus kissing the Calves, and an Image, is an act of Adoration, because the Object is an object of Adoration; but kissing the Book is not, because a Book is no object of Adoration.

If it be asked, Why then is the Book kissed? I say, it's in token of Reverence, as it's the Book of God; and which, if I so kiss every time I read it, it's surely far from being Idolatry. And that it is so, appears from what follows, *So help me God, and the Contents of this Book;* which is in different ways, God by his Grace, and the Contents of this Book by their Instruction; the one as the efficient, the other the instrumental cause. And thus without doubt is meant in the old Form, *So help me God, and these Holy Evangelists;* that is, the Gospel wrote by them; as the name of *Moses* is given in Scripture to his Writings. So that in this sense it's neither Idolatry in them, nor any thing like it in us. And we may as lawfully kiss the Book, as lift up the Hand, since neither of them are prohibited by God's Law; and so being indifferent in themselves, we may act as the case requires.

E R R A T A.

Page 5. l. 22. before *But* put 2.

P. 7. l. 6. for 4 r. 3.

P. 9 l. 20. r. *Idolaters.*

P. 13. l. 13. r. *Greeks and.*

l. 20 and 23. r. *Jephthah.*

l. 29. r. *Rabbin.*

P. 25. l. 28. after *one* put, after *Letter* dele,

P. 26. l. 30. r. *Scripta.*

P. 27. l. 33. dele 1.

P. 29. l. 3. r. *Salmur.*

l. 23. r. *4th.*

P. 30. l. 9. r. *Summ.*

l. 12. for 2 r. 3.

P. 31. l. 2. place 1.

P. 34. l. 3. r. *vein.*

l. 11. r. *and the first.*

P. 36. l. 4. r. *and the Contents.*

F I N I S.